

## AMENDMENT

W:\users\ted\wpdata\M2009-13.am1

M2009-13.AM1

## REMARKS

Claim 20 is in the application and was examined.

Claim 20 stands rejected.

No new matter is added to the application.

2. **Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), four references cited**

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a] as being unpatentable over Jackson 3646610 in view of the admitted prior art to Sugiyama [JP09131588], Kusumoto [US 6106413] and Utsono [US5231783].

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 20 recites, inter alia, a first reinforcement layer of first fiber materials having fibers aligned along a single direction; first and second materials forming a first angled layer and having fibers aligned along a single direction; the fibers of the second materials forming a first angle with the fibers of the third material; a first straight layer of fourth fiber material having fibers aligned along a single direction; a second angled layer formed from fifth and sixth materials having fibers aligned along a single direction, and having a thickness in the range of from 0.04 to 0.1mm, these fibers forming a second angle in the range of 70-150 degrees; a second straight layer of second fiber material having fibers aligned along a single direction; and a second reinforcement layer from an eighth fiber material having fibers aligned along a single direction.

Jackson discloses layers of fiber glass strands enclosed in a resinous binder, some of the layers being provided with a layer of random-oriented short lengths of chopped glass fibers enclosed within the resinous binder.

Consequently absolutely none of the Jackson layers are formed from

## AMENDMENT

M2009-13.AM1

W:\users\ted\wpdata\M2009-13.am1

materials having fibers aligned along a single direction, as is specifically required. For this reason alone, Jackson does not and cannot be applied in an obvious consideration of claim 20, and Applicants propose claim 20 is patentable thereover.

Moreover, the Examiner states that the angle formed by cross layers 63' and 64' in Figure 17 of Jackson is slightly larger than 90 degrees and concludes that this falls well within the range of 70-150 degrees defined in claim 20. However, Jackson specifically states that Figures 16 and 17 are identical except that an additional layer 72' has been added in Figure 17. In column 5, lines 25-29, Jackson states, "layer 60' is encased in a layer 62" of spirally wound or braided fiber glass strands 63' and 64', the spiral wound layer 62' being covered by short chopped fiber glass filaments 65' disposed in random orientation." Hence strands 63' and 64' are not cross layers and do not form any angle whatsoever. Hence, Jackson does not fairly disclose, teach, suggest, or offer motivation for this claimed angle, and for this reason alone claim 20 is patentable over Jackson and the remaining references.

None of the other references fairly cure the deficiencies of Jackson as an anticipation of claim 20. None of the references fairly teach, show, or support the claimed angle. None of the references teach, shown, or support the multiplicity of materials having fibers aligned along single directions; none of them show the combination of angles using such material and fiber alignments.

Consequently, after a complete review of the references, claim 20 is respectfully suggested as allowable over the combination of applied references and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Applicants respectfully submit, that the prior art combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. The teachings or

## AMENDMENT

M2009-13.AM1

W:\users\ted\wpdata\M2009-13.am1

suggestions to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both 'as a whole' be found in the prior art, and not based upon Applicant's disclosure MPEP § 2142. Applicants respectfully note that the motivation to combine references must be clearly and adequately taught in the references themselves. See *In re Lee* No.00-1158 (CAFC) (Jan. 18, 2002) vacating an obviousness ruling of the Board where factual support from the references was not specifically supplied in direct relation to the references..

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references as proposed by the Examiner, neither fairly teach or suggest, all of the claim limitations of the present invention, nor provide a suggested desirability for the necessary modifications and additions, nor provide a reasonable expectation of success without further modification. In sum, Applicants respectfully propose that claim 20 is allowable for the above reason and earnestly solicit timely notification to that end.

## FILING STATUS OF PRESENT APPLICATION

The present application is a division of application SN 09/193928 filed 11/17/98. It is requested that the record be corrected (it currently and incorrectly shows this application as a continuation) and a new formal identification form be made of record.

## CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. In view of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment,

## AMENDMENT

M2009-13.AM1

W:\users\ted\wpdata\M2009-13.1

to Deposit Account No. 13-4550. No new matter is added.

In the spirit of condensed and streamlined practice, if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be of value, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned counsel at the number listed below for prompt response.

Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Theodore Jay Esq.  
Registration No. 17,071  
Attorney for Applicant

The Morrison Building  
145 North Fifth Avenue  
Mount Vernon, New York 10550  
(914) 667-6755  
Date: 02/14/02